

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 are rejected. In the July 29, 2010 Final Office Action, the Examiner:

1. Rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Knobl et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0025376), in view of *Jutzi et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0095939).

Claims 1-26 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 22 and 25 to recite subject matter already recited in claims 1 and 14. Specifically, claims 22 and 25 now recite that a plurality of digital television data streams are received by a plurality of television receiver modules in the digital television reception unit, and that the video data, audio data, and miscellaneous data are communicated on the network to a display connected to the network, and the miscellaneous data is communicated when requested. No new matter is added. Applicants also respectfully submit that no new issues are raised requiring further searching since the added subject matter has already been recited in claims 1 and 14.

As to the rejections, Applicants traverse. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Knobl et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0025376), in view of *Jutzi et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0095939). Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Knobl* nor *Jutzi*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 25.

A. Claim 1

The Examiner responded to Applicants' previous argument stating that Applicants are attacking the references individually when a combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* has been asserted. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner equates the recited "evaluation unit configured to receive miscellaneous data" with the *Knobl* control unit 12 that receives programming information and organizes it in

classifications; then argues for a combination of *Knobl* with *Jutzi*. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's equating of the "evaluation unit" with the *Knobl* control unit. If *Knobl* does not teach what the Examiner argues it teaches, then the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* do not obviate claim 1.

Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* also fails because *Knobl* does not teach or suggest "a television reception unit ... comprising a plurality of television receiver modules" as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner argued with respect to claim 1 that:

Regarding claim 1, *Knobl et al.* teaches a digital television system in a vehicle (Figure 1) comprising: ...

a television reception unit [6, 14, 15] that processes a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data, the television reception unit further comprising:

a plurality of television receiver module [6, 8, 9] each configured to receive one of a plurality of digital transmission signals (Figure 1, Paragraphs 0039, 0041); ...

Knobl shows a TV (No. 6 in FIG. 1). However, *Knobl* fails to provide any teaching that the TV 6 processes a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data. Ref. Nos. 14 and 15 in FIG. 1 of *Knobl* are not television reception units. Ref. Nos. 14 and 15 are operating units, which are used as user controllers to control the program being played. *See Knobl* FIGs. 3-5, and do not "process a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data."

The TV 6 in *Knobl* (FIG. 1) also does not include a plurality of television receiver modules. *Knobl* fails to provide any teaching of the capabilities of the TV 6. Ref. Nos. 8 and 9 are not television receiver modules. Ref. Nos. 8 and 9 are monitors that do not process a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data. Monitors 8 and 9 process only video data.

Claim 1 recites that a display, an operating unit and a television reception unit communicate over a network. The television reception unit includes the plurality of television receiver modules and processes the digital transmission signals received by the television receiver modules to transmit the audio, video and miscellaneous data contained in the digital

transmission signals over the network. The Examiner argued that the plurality of television receiver modules (being 6, 8, and 9) are connected by a network, which violates the wording of claim 1.

Knobl does not teach a television reception unit having a plurality of television receiver modules as recited in claim 1. The Examiner argued that *Knobl* teaches such a television reception unit in asserting the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi*. Therefore, the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the television reception unit as recited in claim 1.

B. Claim 14

Claim 14 the digital television reception unit limitation of the system in claim 1 as an independent claim. Claim 14 recites that the digital television reception unit comprises a plurality of digital television reception modules. Therefore, the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the television reception unit as recited in claim 14.

C. Claims 22 and 25

Claim 22 is a method claim for a method for receiving digital television signals in a mobile digital television reception system. Claim 25 is a means-plus-function claim reciting a digital television reception unit. Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the “plurality of digital data streams comprising coded and compressed television signals at a plurality of television receiver modules in a television receiver unit connected to a network.” Claim 25 is a digital television reception unit comprising means for receiving a plurality of data streams of digital television signals.

Claims 22 and 25 have also been amended to clarify that the audio data, video data, and miscellaneous data are transmitted over the network to a display connected to the network, and that the miscellaneous data is communicated in response to a request for the miscellaneous data.

Therefore, the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the method for receiving digital television signals or the television reception unit as recited in claim 22 and 25, respectively.

II. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 25 are not obvious over *Knobl* in view of *Jutzi*. Therefore, claims 2-13, which are dependent on claim 1; claims 15-21, which are dependent on claim 14; claims 23-24, which are dependent on claim 22; and claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25 are also allowable for the same reasons as claims 1, 14, 22, and 25.

CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/29/10



Jennifer H. Hamilton
The Eclipse Group LLP
10605 Balboa Blvd., Suite 300
Granada Hills, CA 91344
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
jhh@eclipsegrp.com

Customer No.: **34408**

CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/29/10


Jennifer H. Hamilton
The Eclipse Group LLP
10605 Balboa Blvd., Suite 300
Granada Hills, CA 91344
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
jhh@eclipsegrp.com

Customer No.: **34408**